

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-42773-2018 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:-05.10.2018.

Dilbag Singh @ Goli and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI**

\*\*\*\*

Present: Mr. Mohit Garg, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (Oral)**

In this petition, petitioners are seeking anticipatory bail under the provisions of Section 438 Cr.P.C. in FIR No.202 dated 09.09.2018 under Sections 452/324/323/427/506/148/149 IPC, registered at Police Station Jamalpur, Ludhiana.

2.) Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that all the offences are bailable and injury No.1 even though it is a sharp injury, at the same time, allegation should have been only against one person in respect of first injury is concerned. Therefore, there is no specific allegation so as to find out who has caused injury No.1.

3.) *Per contra* learned State counsel while resisting the petitioner's contention, on instructions from ASI Jasbir Singh submitted that having

regard to the conduct of the petitioners in respect of beatings and causing

injuries with reference to parking of a vehicle, petitioners have attacked the complainant and other members while injuring 5 persons whereas Mandeep Singh got 5 injuries. Further for the second time, petitioners have attacked complainants-respondents whereby complainants were compelled to lock the door from the inside on the same day within few hours of such incident. Thus, petitioners have terrorized the complainant and other injured persons.

4.) Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

5.) Petitioners' contention that injury No.1 and rest of the injuries are bailable offences except Section 452 IPC, insofar as conduct of the petitioners, it is to be noted that they have manhandled Ranjit Kaur, Mandeep Singh, Mandeep Kaur and Harpreet Singh. Thus, petitioners have not only manhandled the complainant and others, they have also caused injuries on them, even though the injuries are minor except the first injury caused on Mandeep Singh which is stated to be sharp in nature. At the same time, it cannot be ignored that the petitioners entered into the house of complainant/injured and gave injuries to them, manhandling and causing injuries on women. So also Section 452 IPC is attracted. Hence, petitioners have not made out a case so as to extend them anticipatory bail.

6.) Accordingly, petition stands dismissed.

**(P.B. BAJANTHRI)**  
**JUDGE**

**October 05, 2018.**

sandeep

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No.